



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,280	09/25/2003	John L. Puskaric	DB001018-002	6563

24122 7590 10/18/2004

THORP REED & ARMSTRONG, LLP
ONE OXFORD CENTRE
301 GRANT STREET, 14TH FLOOR
PITTSBURGH, PA 15219-1425

EXAMINER

AMIRI, NAHID

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3635

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/671,280

Applicant(s)

PUSKARIC ET AL.

Examiner

Nahid Amiri

Art Unit

3635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 4, 5 and 7 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6, 8-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent No. 4,481,887 Urbano.

In regard to claims 1, 3, 6: Urbano discloses the claimed invention Fig. 1, column 3, lines 60-64, security doors 1 having first pair of panels (doors) 3 for separating an unsecured area from a vestibule (walkway) 5, column 4, lines 33-37, the motor control unit 18 outer door motor open doors 3 and allow a person to enter the vestibule 5 after which the doors close automatically, Fig. 6, column 5, lines 30-40, the relay 24 used to as an identifier for approving a person, having a second pair of panels (inner doors) 3 separating the vestibule 5 from a secured area from an open position to closed position after the person has passed therethrough. Urbano does not disclose the method of controlling traffic within a plurality of panels. Urbano discloses all the structural limitations; therefore, it would have been obvious steps method for moving the traffic within the panels.

In regard to claims 8-9: Urbano discloses the claimed invention column 5, lines 41-50, having switch 23 for opening the second pair of panels (inner doors) 3 which separate secured area from vestibule 5 from open position to closed position when identify the person is not approved and trap unauthorized person inside the vestibule 5. Urbano does not disclose the method of closing second pair of panels or doors from open to closed position if person is identified as not approved. Urbano discloses all the structural limitations; therefore, it would

Art Unit: 3635

have been obvious steps method of closing the inner doors or panels in case unauthorized person enters the secured area and trapping the unauthorized person inside the vestibule.

Claims 2 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Urbano in view of US Patent No. 6,720,874 B2 Fufido et al.

In regard to claim 2: Urbano discloses the claimed invention except identifying the person while the person is in the unsecured area. Fufido teaches Fig. 1, column 5, lines 48-55, having a camera 22 for identifying the person in unsecured area before entering into secured area. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to provide a camera outside of security door in order to prevent unauthorized entry from a public area into a secure area as taught by Fufido.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4-5, 7 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed August 19, 2004, with respect to claims 4-5, 7 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 4-5, 7 has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nahid Amiri whose telephone number is (703) 305-4241 and Fax number is 703-305-9306. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00-

Application/Control Number: 10/671,280

Page 4

Art Unit: 3635

5:30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Carl Friedman can be reached at (703) 308-0839.

na 

October 5, 2004



Carl D. Friedman
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3600